The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRANSFERRED AUG 1914

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 5
No. 4

AUGUST
1914

THE YELLOW AND THE RED

CONDITION OF WOMAN IN ENGLAND NO REASON FOR MILITANCY

THE RIGHT AND WRONG BASES FOR GRANTING SUFFRAGE

NEIGHBOR STATES WARN NEVADA

"FREE FROM ALL LIMITATIONS"

WHEN THEORY MEETS PRACTICE

HOW SUFFRAGE STATES VOTE

REPORTS FROM STATE ASSOCIATIONS

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1913, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.; Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.
General Sec'y, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. James M. Codman, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. Augustus Gardner, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbot, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Trenton, N. J.
Miss Jane U. Rutherfoord, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. Brookes Brown, Burlington, Vt.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Elizabeth Burnell, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover, Mrs. Wm. B. Williams.
Treasurer, Mrs. Albert S. Cooke.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Walter S. Schulz, Hartford.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Wm. T. Howe, 41 Lorraine Street, Hartford.

DELAWARE

ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE, WILMINGTON

Chairman, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. David A. Reinhardt.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson.
First Vice-President, Mrs. W. E. Godfrey.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. N. K. Troutman, Mrs. J. E. Peacock.
Secretary, Mrs. B. L. Sutton.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. S. E. Moore, Macon.
Treasurer, Mrs. A. T. Holt.
Chairman Press Committee, Miss Pendleton.

IOWA COMMITTEE

President, Mrs. Martin Flynn.
Secretary, Mrs. Simon Casady, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

MARYLAND

Office: Garrett Building, German and South Streets, Baltimore.
President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Halsup Adams, Mrs. Arthur B. Kinsolving, Mrs. Michael Wild.
Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose.

MAINE

President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Philip W. McIntyre, Mrs. David W. Snow.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Mrs. George S. Hobbs, 48 Neal Street, Portland.

MASSACHUSETTS

Office: 615 Boylston Street, Boston.

President, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell.
Treasurer, *pro tem*, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Recording Secretary, Miss E. C. Post.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Boston.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. E. Clark, Mrs. C. A. Kent, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain, Miss Stella Ford.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. C. E. Conant, Wells; Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
Secretary, Mrs. Frank E. McGray, St. Paul.
Treasurer, Miss I. M. Schemmel, St. Paul.
Hon. Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Daniel R. Noyes, Mrs. H. S. Fairchild, St. Paul.
Board of Governors: Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Mrs. Alfred Pillsbury, Mrs. George H. Christian, Minn.; Mrs. D. F. DeWolf, Mrs. J. E. Ricketts, Mrs. Morton Barrows, Mrs. William Plant, St. Paul.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. Thomas C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEBRASKA

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Chairman; Mrs. Henry W. Yates, Mrs. John C. Cowin, Mrs. J. W. Griffith, Mrs. W. H. Koenig, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Mrs. Gerrit Fort, Mrs. John L. Webster, Mrs. Helen Arion Lewis, Mrs. Arthur Crittenden Smith, Mrs. T. J. Mackay, Mrs. F. N. Conner, Miss Janet M. Wallace.
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street, Omaha.
Treasurer, Mrs. Frank J. Hoel, 110 South 34th Street.
Mrs. J. W. Crumpacker, Special Representative National Association, 536 Bee Building, Omaha.

NEVADA

President, Mrs. Jewett Adams, Carson City (wife of former Governor).
First Vice-President, Mrs. R. G. Withers.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. D. Folsom, Mrs. J. E. Pickard, Mrs. C. L. Harwood, Mrs. Frank Bell, Mrs. F. J. Peck, Mrs. Frank M. Lee, Mrs. R. L. Fulton.
Secretary, Mrs. Fred Stadtmuller.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Katherine Collins.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. W. Hill.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.

Honorary President, Miss Dayton.
President, Mrs. Edward Yarde Breese.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Alexander F. Jamieson, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Mrs. Cornelius Hook, Mrs. Thomas Craven, Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, Mrs. John R. Emery, Mrs. William J. Libbey, Miss H. O. Magie, Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Miss Clara Vezin, Mrs. Carl G. Roebling, Mrs. William S. Stryker.
Treasurer, Mrs. George B. Yarde.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. R. C. Maxwell.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. A. E. Pendergast.
General Secretary, Mrs. Orville D. Oliphant.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th Street, New York.

President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. William P. Northrup.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Loomis.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young.
Vice-President, Mrs. C. N. Frick, Mrs. J. G. Gundersen, Mrs. E. B. Goss, Mrs. C. E. Wolf, Mrs. T. L. Beiseker, Mrs. L. B. Dochterman, Mrs. H. C. Chaffee, Mrs. R. H. Bosard, Miss M. O. Movine, Mrs. C. W. Plain, Mrs. J. W. Reynolds.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

President, Mrs. H. E. Talbot, Dayton.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Joseph Crane, Dayton; Mrs. John M. Gundry, Cleveland; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. Frank Ray, Granville.
Cincinnati and Hamilton County Office: 208 Neave Building, Cincinnati.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 261 South Fifteenth Street, Philadelphia.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Mrs. Frank Samuel, Mrs. William W. Birdsall, Miss Grace Falkner, Miss Sophy Dallas Irwin, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. John Markoe, Miss Mary Newhall.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Louise C. Hoppin, Mrs. Howard O. Sturges, Mrs. Stephen O. Metcalf.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard.
Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. Brookes Brown.
Vice-President, Mrs. George W. Wales.
Secretary, Mrs. M. H. Buckham, Burlington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Clarence Morgan.
Executive Committee, Mrs. G. G. Benedict, Mrs. Addison B. Buell, Mrs. Merritt D. Chittenden, Miss Bertha Terrill.

VIRGINIA

President, Miss Jane U. Rutherfoord.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. William F. Gray.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Hunsdon Cary, Mrs. Arthur P. Wilmer, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. James Lyons.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell, 1714 Grove Avenue, Richmond.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

1402 H Street, N. W.

President, Mrs. Augustus P. Gardner.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. John W. Weeks, Mrs. Douglas P. Birnie.
Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Davis.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Esther Denny.
Treasurer, Miss Alice Card.
Executive Committee, Mrs. William W. Mathewson, Mrs. Frederick Keep, Mrs. E. Rollins Morse, Mrs. Swager Sherley, Miss Josephine Patten, Mrs. William Cogswell, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard.

WISCONSIN

President, Miss Mary L. Atwood.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Geo. H. Noyes.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Frank L. Vance.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude S. Bean, 4 Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

THE YELLOW AND THE RED

By Mrs. Simeon H. Guilford,

Member Executive Board, Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

IT will be remembered that the Socialism and I. W. W. defender, Max Eastman, on his last visit to Philadelphia, told the conservative Suffragists in one of their own private drawing-rooms "wholesome truths as to the unimportance of the ballot, etc.," and preached "ultra Socialistic" doctrines to them. Now, what are the "wholesome truths" that Max Eastman expounds in his self-styled "revolutionary publication," *The Masses?* Well, for one thing, it ought to be of interest to the Christian ladies who entertained him in Philadelphia to read the poem he publishes in the current issue, entitled, "God's Blunder," in which the lines occur:

A dump marked "church" and a hole marked "home,"
And a doll called "mother" that boxed your jaws,
And a bubble "wealth" of shivering foam,
And the precious toys called "Codes" and "Laws."

Also:

Stooping God stumbled and almost swore—
He almost let out a ripping damn.

Hear, too, what this revolutionary has to say of the soldiers and sailors of the United States, the kind of men for whom Philadelphia held the largest funeral and the greatest military mass in its history several weeks ago. "Hundreds of degenerate adventurers in blood from all the slums and vice camps of the earth * * * putting them beyond the law in uniforms of the national army."

Now what significance have Eastman's personal views on the woman suffrage issue, and especially with the National Association's connection with feminism and revolutionary doctrines? Simply this: The National American Suffrage Association, through its publishing company, carries a standing advertisement in Eastman's publication, calling attention to Eastman's "exposition of the 'beautiful futility of the slave goddess sentiment' and 'the home and mother sentiment' and inviting 'Socialist Suffragists' to 'follow carefully the progress of the votes for women movement.'"

This means that conservative Suffragists, who will attack a woman in their own ranks for leading a militant organization—when militancy is unpopular—are ready to officially support and court the return assistance of feminists who rant at religion, insult our national honor and mock our morals and our civilization. Of course, "there is a reason" for all of it.

In a statement in the *Ledger* on July 3d a Suffragist said the total membership of the suffrage organization throughout the country is between 600,000 and 700,000. Now disregarding the fact that this represents less than 3 per cent. of the women of voting age, we remember that the Socialist party polled nearly a million votes in 1910. According to the official announcements and parade insignia, "Every Socialist is a Suffragist." In other words, though a million Socialists are Suffragists, yet only three-fourths of them have joined the organization! Of course, there are Suffragists who are not Socialists; but necessarily they are in the great minority if all these official suffrage figures are correct.

Is it any wonder then that the National Association backs Eastman and puts the writings of this Socialist-feminist at the head of its list of "what to read on woman suffrage," and advertises especially to "Socialist Suffragists" who support "revolutionary" magazines that libel religion, government, womanhood, the family and the home?

Life recently said of Eastman: "People of average sense read a lot of violent and foolish talk, and think of it only as foolish talk. But presently some one is shot by a crazy or half-crazy man, and then the talk gets to seem more serious. Brother Eastman, of *The Masses*, might profitably take notice of this phenomenon."

The Suffragettes, conservatives and radicals march in parades with the red banners of Socialism following the yellow badges of "Votes for Women," and lend the weight of their national association's approval to the utterances of revolutionary feminists.

Also no one can forget that Mrs. Pankhurst, the leader of British militants, was feted and financed by American Suffragists here, who glorified her former crimes and cheerfully gave her the "sinews of war" wherewith to commit additional outrages on her return to England.

The National Suffrage Association "deplores the blindness of young women" who threaten congressmen with a resort to militancy—while at the same time it indorses the efforts of men who defend rebellion and "sabotage."

In other words, the association fears that militancy in the hands of American women would prove a poor weapon. It is willing, however, to approve militancy to obtain the vote, if the measures advocated by Eastman and the members of the I. W. W.—or I Won't Work crowd—will help the "cause."

It seems to be a problem in generalship rather than in method. The Congressional Union leader believes that militancy "a la Pankhurst" would be effective. The National Association, with better knowledge of the stern reception women militants would get in America, hesitates, but meanwhile supports Eastman's encouragement of revolution and I. W. W. tactics that may finally lead to "a la McNamara" militancy.

It remains to be seen which kind of militancy we are to have in America if this agitation of less than 3 per cent. of our women, backed by Socialists and feminists, is not firmly handled in time.

The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart. Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. V August, 1914 No. 4

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

APPEAL FOR FUNDS

WOMAN suffrage is to be voted on next November by the electorates in the States of Nebraska, Nevada, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Missouri and possibly Ohio. The National American Woman Suffrage Association has made an appeal for $50,000 for campaigns in these States.

For the first time since the organization of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage we make a similar appeal for funds. We need $15,000, and ask our readers and friends to send contributions of any amount from one dollar up. Each contribution must be accompanied by the full name and address of the donor.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage have been formed in Nebraska, Nevada, Montana, North Dakota, and organizations will soon be effected in South Dakota and Missouri. Ohio already has a State Association. These newly formed organizations must have help, and any anti-suffragist can realize the importance of these campaign States. Will you help us?

The first substantial contribution to this fund comes from Miss Minnie Bronson who has sent a letter to the PROTEST announcing that she will give her services for two months in the Western States, without salary. Will other contributors please make checks payable to Caroline W. Stewart, Treas.

THE "WONDERFUL" VOTE IN CHICAGO

MUCH has been written and said in regard to the "wonderful" vote of the women of Chicago at the elections in April. The following are the official figures of both the men's and the women's vote in that city. The numbers of men and women over voting age given include those who are unnaturalized or disqualfied for other reasons. The census does not give the number who are qualified to vote.

Number of men over 21 years	700,590
Number of men who registered	455,283
Number of men who voted	314,863

69.1 per cent. of the men who registered voted.
65 per cent. of the men who were over voting age registered.
44.7 per cent. of those over voting age cast their vote.

Number of women over 21 years	516,297
Number of women who registered	217,614
Number of women who voted	163,852

75.2 per cent. of the women who registered voted.
47.7 per cent. of the women who were over voting age registered.
31.7 per cent. of those over voting age cast their vote.

LLOYD GEORGE'S DEFINITION OF POLITICS

MR. LLOYD GEORGE is a woman Suffragist. He believes that woman should enter politics, and here is what he says of the politician's life:

"Every time they get a glimpse of you behind the counter they shriek at you opprobrious epithets. When they see you weigh a pound of sugar they shout out that three-fourths of it is sand. When you measure cloth they swear that it is rather shoddy. You have, moreover, all the time you are attending to customers to dodge bricks, clods and worse, hurled at your head. Most of you would, I think, rather give up business even if you had to break stones for a livelihood.

"That is what politics are like, and I can assure you that we would not have done it for a living."

Now this is the field of endeavor which Suffragists are trying to force on the mothers of the race and which men have been willing to spare them. Suffragists may have avoided some of these experiences so far, relying, as they do, on the chivalry of men toward woman which is not yet entirely extinct; but Anti-Suffragists can vouch for the truth of the description, for they have had some "dodging" to do from the "bricks, clods and worse" which the champions of our sex do not hesitate to hurl at whoever disagrees with them. Anti-Suffragists are quite accustomed to being accused of the most crude and sensational political alliances, just as Mr. Lloyd George is of putting sand in the sugar and selling shoddy for cloth. They can endure this for a term in order to prevent its becoming a permanent inconvenience to the indefinite damage of womanhood, and therefore to the race. It is kind and liberal of man Suffragists to throw open the gates of the arena where they "delight to bark and bight" to women, but sensible women decline with thanks. They have troubles of their own.

J. T. W.

You have no enemy, you say?
Alas, my friend, the boast is poor,
You have not battled in the fray
Of duty that the brave endure,
You've hit no traitor on the hip,
You've dashed no cup from perjured lip,
You've never turned the wrong to right—
You've been a coward in the fight.

MARIE CORELLI.

REAL CONDITION OF WOMAN IN ENGLAND OFFERS NEITHER EXCUSE NOR NECESSITY FOR MILITANCY

By Alexander Wenyon Samuel

(From the New York *World*, June 28, 1914)

UNTIL the dawn of the spineless age physical force will always be man's final political argument. From the beginning of civilization man has ever been ready to fight for political freedom and his march to liberty has been a steady advance over battlefields. That is the common teaching of all history. "The dread arbitrament of the sword" is a household phrase. But "The dread arbitrament of the hatchet, hat-pin and the match-box" is a phrase to which the Anglo-Saxon people are not yet accustomed. And the spectacle of the employment of physical force by women is a very horrid and disgusting novelty, whose first appeal was to the morbid instinct and now has become by its persistence the chief revulsion of right-thinking men and women.

It is such a crude challenge to our ideals of the true relations of men and women. A physical battle between the two sexes reflects reproachfully upon both. Man is fearful to use his greater strength to resist women's known lesser strength. He is restrained in the bonds of age-long custom which tend to make him physically impotent in such a combat. For of all the times when a man is not afraid of a woman the chief is when she shakes her fist in his face. And now that she is smashing her more or less puny fist in his face he is still not afraid, but he is very dazed. He has been enduring the assault without equal reprisal, preferring the unequalness of male non-resistence to the unequalness that would condition full male resistance. And so in England the furies have been having it largely their own way, though the present signs indicate that the practically non-resistant attitude of the forces of law and order may be succeeded by the untempered oppugnancy of the mob. Then will be interpreted those old words, "They who appeal to the sword shall perish by the sword."

The excuse for the employment of militancy by women in the agitation for the parliamentary franchise in England is based upon two grounds:

1. That men have always employed force to secure their political rights, and

2. That the laws of England are so unjust to women that they have been compelled by the indignity of their condition to acts of lawlessness common to all outlaws.

With the first arguments we are not much concerned. Suffice it to say that physical force is the one argument not at women's disposal, and that in the example of the brutal exercise of muscle traditional with men women has neither guide nor hope.

But with the second we are concerned, and it is proposed to show that it is both illogical and untrue.

It is illogical because the breaking of the law is no proper method to employ in a constitutional country in order to secure the protection of existing law or the passing of new law. To say that the present laws are inadequate for women's protection and then to proceed to violate all the laws of society that protects both men and women is hardly a logical attitude indicating the fitness of women to be called into legislative councils of a great nation.

Let it be said at once, and this is most important in view of the gross misrepresentation that has been made in this country, that the laws of England relating to women are substantially the same as the laws of America relating to women. Where they discriminate between men and women it is always in favor of women. The only possible exception relates to the divorce, and that would have been altered long ago if public opinion had been heeded. The only reason that divorce law reform has been halted on its way to the statute book is the too strong clerical opposition expressed by the High Church Bishops in the House of Lords and the High Church laymen in the House of Commons. There is no need for women to have the vote to secure that reform. It will be secured by the gradual accendancy of secular over priestly influence in Parliament. For let it be borne in mind that divorce is a rather modern innovation in English law, little more than sixty years old, save by a process so cumbrous and expensive that only the very rich could afford it. And to-day divorce carries with it the gravest social consequences. The names of people on the court list against whom the decree of divorce is pronounced are depleted, and they receive no further summonses to appear before the King and Queen. And in lower ranks of life a divorced person is almost as socially taboo as if he or she had been to prison for a criminal offense.

In actual divorce court practice, the distinction, the grounds upon which divorce is granted is much more nominal than real, it being held that when there is flagrant adultery the granting of a divorce is desirable. The additional proof required of a wife of either cruelty or desertion is often recognized when the eye could not see it. The husband, it is true, need only prove the adultery of his wife, which with all its potential consequences and proof of dead conjugal love is surely sufficient. And while the wife must prove in addition to adultery (1) cruelty; that is found when he is a man of violent temper, making "scenes in his household" or swearing at the partner of his sorrows, and does not mean that he must actually strike her; or (2) desertion, which is the polite way, and which is done by his leaving their common residence and declaring in writing his intentions of never returning. Upon this she secures an order from the court for restitution of conjugal rights, which he disobeys, and then she petitions for full divorce upon proving that he has disappeared in order to indulge in "substitution" of conjugal rights.

But it is true that there is a nominal discrepancy and opinion in England heartily in favor of its abolition, and it will be abolished in due course, whether women get the vote or not. Meanwhile in the interpretation of the law practical hardship is prevented as much as possible. This, however, must be borne in mind that no law will ever prevent the sufferings of a wife who is married to a man debased in morals and brutal in temper. And this also shall be whispered, no law will ever prevent the sufferings of a man married to a woman with no ideas of home life, no sense of marital responsibility and whose annihilation of domestic happiness is the fruit of her endless tongue-torture, or slatternly extravagant or venal habits.

Having dealt first with the particular instance of divorce, which is the one discrimination between men and women to the disadvantage of women in English law, let us turn to the other side of the matter, and here is the statement of a great authority, the Earl Loreburn, Lord High Chancellor of England for 1905-1912.

Lord Loreburn said: "Taken as a whole our laws are more merciful to women than to men, and are more mercifully administered toward women than toward men." This would be so for two reasons, viz., that the remedy of society against law-breakers is the exercise of physical force by the authorities of society; and the desire of every man to secure protection for both the property and the persons of his women-folk.

Therefore we find running all the way through the law of England as in America, that women are exempt from responsibilities which men carry, because failure to observe them results

in imprisonment, and society always avoids the imprisonment of women when possible, since it is the expression of physical force toward the weaker sex. Here are some examples:

The law holds the father and not the mother responsible for the maintenance and care of the children. He is the legal guardian; she is the domestic guardian. If the husband fail to provide for the maintenance and education of his children he will be sent to prison. The wife is always held blameless and non-responsible, and may deposit them and herself upon the poor law authorities for maintenance. Further, if the wife be possessed of large private means not one cent of her income can be attached to maintain her children if her husband be alive and able to work. He and he alone is responsible. But if there were no father she could be compelled to pay the actual maintenance charges incurred by the poor law authorities amounting to a dollar and a quarter per week while she herself might live in a house at a rental of $5,000 per year. Whereas the father must support his children according to his means, and the wife, in case of separation, can secure through the courts an allowance for the education of the children in their proper station in addition to the maintenance of herself in her proper station.

The wife can never be compelled to support her husband. However large her means he can never force her, by legal proceedings, to maintain him. If he should fall sick and be unable to support himself she may turn him out of her house, and all she can be required to do is to pay the poor law authorities the actual amount of his maintenance as a pauper, about $1.25 to $2 per week.

He may not will all his money away from his wife and children, his estate after death must provide as in life. She may will her money absolutely as she chooses. He is responsible for all her reasonable expenditure for clothes, etc.; but however large her income, she is in no way responsible for his. And daughters of adult age living with their father can also pledge his credit for all reasonable expenditure upon clothes, etc. And in the case of a rich father the amount would be large and he must pay.

No woman can be made bankrupt unless she is in trade.

No woman can be indicted for any crime committed by a wife in the presence of her husband. She is held to have committed it under duress.

No action can be brought against a wife for slander or libel; it must be brought against the husband. And the fact that she has large means would not alter the fact.

The married woman's property act was passed in England as far back as 1870, amended and strengthened in 1874 and brought to its final state of splendid protection in 1882. Is it conceivable when we know how father's toil and sacrifice to make provision for their wives and daughters that they would persistently refuse to legislate to protect those women folk in the possession of the property they bequeath to them after they are gone?

Woman in England is absolutely protected in both property and person under the English law to-day, and a great legal authority, Sir Edward Clarke, K. C., challenged the Suffragists to state a single law they desired to have amended, or passed, which they could not get a hearing for to-day because they had no votes, and offered a large sum to a charity if proved, but no claim has been made.

Women have voted in England upon all domestic questions, when qualified on the same ground as men, since the '80's. This vote covers housing, police, control of liquor traffic, care of the poor, of children, feeble-minded and insane, sanitation, etc.; all those questions about which women are supposed to be concerned. Further, they are summoned to sit upon Royal Commissions to consider amendments to laws, as the Divorce Commission and the Poor Law Commission, and not merely do they so directly initiate laws, but specially qualified women are summoned to give evidence before such commissions, so that there should be no chance of the views of women not being directly expressed.

What then is all the fuss in England about, and whence comes militancy? The fact is that there are in England 1,000,000 more women than men, due largely to the drainages of the colonies; 3,000,000 unmarried women between the ages of 20 and 50. That is due to our so-called civilization, but it is in fact a barbarous condition of things and proves that civilization has its penalties. And a small faction of those women find in violence an outlet for their unhusbanded energies.

THE RIGHT AND WRONG BASES FOR GRANTING SUFFRAGE

THE Nebraska Men's Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage recently circulated the following:

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE STATE OF NEBRASKA:

At a meeting of men lately held in the city of Omaha the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"RESOLVED, That it is the sense of this meeting that a manifesto be prepared, issued and circulated, setting forth the reasons for our opposition to the pending constitutional amendment providing for equal (woman) suffrage and requesting the co-operation of the voters of the State, and that such manifesto be signed by all the men present."

We yield to none in our admiration, veneration and respect for woman. We recognize in her admirable and adorable qualities and sweet and noble influences which make for the betterment of mankind and the advancement of civilization. We have ever been willing and ready to grant to woman every right and protection, even to favoritism in the law, and to give her every opportunity that makes for development and true womanhood. We have a full appreciation of all the great things which have been accomplished by women in education, in charity and in benevolent work, and in other channels of duty too numerous to mention by which both men and women have been benefited, society improved, and the welfare of the human race advanced. We would take from women none of their privileges as citizens, but we do not believe that women are adapted to the political work of the world.

The discussion of all questions growing out of the social and family relations and local economic conditions has no direct relationship to the right of women to participate in the political affairs of government. The right of suffrage does not attach of right to the owners of property, for, if so, all other persons should be disfranchised. It is not a fundamental right of taxpayers, for a great body of men voters are not taxpayers, and nine-tenths of the women who would become voters if woman suffrage were adopted would be non-taxpayers. It is not an inherent right of citizenship, for the time never was in the whole history of the world when the franchise was granted to all citizens.

Taxation and citizenship do not go together, for all persons

who own property located in the United States pay taxes thereon even though they be aliens. The tax attaches to the property even though the owner be a citizen of England or of Germany or of France. If taxation should only attach to citizens, then our vast body of millionaires might escape taxation by taking up their citizenship in Canada or in England.

Franchise is a privilege of government granted only to those to whom the government sees fit to grant it. The extent or the limitations upon that grant of privilege rests in the wisdom and the sound judgment of the statesmen who created and of those who have continued its administration.

Chief Justice Marshall said: "The granting of the franchise has always been regarded in the practice of nations as a matter of expediency and not as an inherent right." That the right of suffrage is not necessarily one of the privileges or immunities of citizenship was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, in Minor *vs.* Happersett, 21 Wallace, 162, and since then has been recognized as a part of the fundamental law of this country. In Gougar *vs.* Timberlake, 148 Indiana, 38, it was again ruled "that the privilege of voting is not an inherent or natural right * * * and there is no right of suffrage except as it is given by the Constitution and the written laws."

Judge Cooley, in his work on "The Principles of Constitutional Law," made an unanswerable statement when he said: "Suffrage cannot be the natural right of the individual, because it does not exist for the benefit of the individual, but for the benefit of the State itself."

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States was brought about by the unlawful attempt of Mrs. Minor to exercise the right of suffrage in violation of law. The decision of the Supreme Court of Indiana was brought about by the wrongful attempt of Helen Gougar to exercise the elective franchise in violation of law.

As a law-abiding people, men and women alike should recognize once and for all that the right of suffrage is not a natural or inherent right of citizenship, but can come only by grant from the government.

We must also recognize that woman suffrage is inconsistent with the fundamental principles upon which our representative government was founded, and to accept it now involves revolutionary changes. The framers of the Federal Constitution, a body of the wisest men the country has ever produced, did not recognize or provide for woman suffrage. No one of the original thirteen States which adopted it provided in their constitutions for woman suffrage. True, it was permitted in New Jersey from 1776 to 1807, a period of thirty-one years, when it was taken away by statute, by reason of unsatisfactory conditions and results.

After the close of the Civil War, the Southern States which had gone into rebellion were admitted back into the Union under constitutions limiting suffrage to men. These precedents in our governmental history were never departed from until in recent years.

The greatest danger to the Republic of the United States to-day, as it always has been in governments where the people rule, is in an excitable and emotional suffrage. If the women of this country would always think coolly and deliberate calmly, if they could always be controlled and act by "judgment and not under passion," they might help us to keep our institutions "eternal as the foundations of the continent itself"; but the philosophers of history, and the experience of the ages past and present tell us in unanswerable arguments, and teach us by illustrations drawn from actual experience, that governments have been overturned or endangered in periods of great excitement by emotional suffrage and the speech and writings of intolerant people.

It was in unrestrained and unlimited democracies, where the populace were swayed by the power of the orator which sometimes reached the degree of frenzy, that the states of Greece were prevented from consolidating into a substantial government and which led to their final overthrow and ultimate destruction. "Open that terrible page of the French Revolution and the days of terrors, when the click of the guillotine and the rush of blood through the streets of Paris demonstrated to what extremities the ferocity of human nature can be driven by political passion. Who led those blood-thirsty mobs? Who shrieked loudest in that hurricane of passion? Woman. Her picture upon the pages of history to-day is indelible.

"In the city of Paris, in those ferocious mobs, the controlling agency, nay, not agency, but the controlling and principal power, came from those whom God has intended to be the soft and gentle angels of mercy throughout the world."

It is within the memory of men now living that agitation, most generally emotional and sometimes turbulent, precipitated the Civil War, which cost this country billions in money and hundreds of thousands of human lives. Before the war began there were men and women in the North who so far forgot their patriotism that they were willing to let the Southern States depart in peace and the Union be dissolved rather than yield up their emotional and sentimental convictions on the question of slavery. If they had succeeded it would have left the South as an independent government and not a single slave would have been freed. It required the sound judgment and the unflinching patriotism of that mighty man, Abraham Lincoln, to still these turbulent waters and to say that the Union should be preserved, with slavery if he could but without slavery if need be. It is that high standard of patriotism this country must have in all its electors if our republican form of government is to be perpetuated.

It is well known that all the Latin races, by reason of their temperamental conditions, are excitable and emotional. Wherever they have attempted republican forms of government revolutions have been frequent. We call in witness the republics of Central and South America.

It has been said if woman suffrage should become universal in the United States that in times of great excitement arising out of sectional questions or local conditions this country would be in danger of State insurrections and seditions and that in less than a hundred years revolutions would occur and our republican form of government would come to an end. The United States should guard against emotional suffrage. What we need is to put more logic and less feeling into public affairs.

This country has already extended suffrage beyond reasonable bounds. Instead of enlarging it there are strong reasons why it should be curtailed. It would have been better for wise and safe government and the welfare of all the people if there had been some reasonable standard of fitness for the ballot.

During the intense feeling and turbulent conditions growing out of the Civil War, suffrage was so extended that many of the Southern States were turned over to the political control of those not sufficiently informed to conduct good government. It has taken half a century of strenuous effort to correct that mistake. The granting of universal woman suffrage would greatly increase the existing evil and put it beyond the possibility of correction except by an ultimate revolution.

We hear it frequently stated that there is no argument against woman suffrage except sentiment. We can reply with equal force that there is no argument for woman suffrage except sentiment, and that often misguided and uninformed. Some Suffragists insist that if woman suffrage became universal "it would set in motion the machinery of an earthly paradise." It was a woman of high standing in the literary and journalistic field who answered: "It is my opinion it would let loose the wheels of purgatory."

Some Suffragists insist that they want the privilege of voting for the purpose of making better laws. We challenge them to

name a State where woman suffrage prevails that has better laws for both men and women than the man-made laws of Nebraska.

Suffragists frequently ask the question: "If we want to vote why should other people object?" If it is wrong they should not ask for it, any more than they should ask the privilege of committing a crime. If it is a wrong against the State every other man and woman has a right to object, and it is their duty to object.

There always have been brilliant women as well as brilliant men, but that brilliancy did not have its birthright in suffrage. We may value paintings and sculpture and musical compositions just as we prize volumes of poetry upon their individual merits, without discrimination or inquiry whether the painter, the sculptor, the composer or the poet is a man or a woman. Yet the world has never known a genius in any of these vocations who has exhibited the qualities of statesmanship. It is only in countries where man has hewed the way to governmental and religious freedom that woman has risen to independence and greatness.

"There are spheres in which feeling should be paramount. There are kingdoms in which the heart should reign supreme. That kingdom belongs to woman—the realm of sentiment, the realm of love, the realm of gentler and holier and kindlier attributes, that make the name of wife, mother and sister next to the name of God himself." But it is not in harmony with suffrage and has no place in government.

We submit these considerations in all candor to the men of this State. Ultimately the decision of this question at the polls is a man's question. We ask your co-operation. We request all persons wishing to join this association to communicate with Mr. J. B. Haynes, Secretary, 748 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Neb. We likewise urge that local organizations be formed.

OMAHA, NEB., July 6, 1914.

Signed by:

JOSEPH H. MILLARD	MILTON C. PETERS
JOHN A. MCSHANE	WILLIAM H. KOENIG
JOHN LEE WEBSTER	W. H. BUCHOLZ
LUTHER DRAKE	FRED H. DAVIS
JOHN C. COWIN	BENJAMIN S. BAKER
WILLIAM F. GURLEY	L. F. CROFOOT
WILLIAM D. MCHUGH	E. E. BRUCE
FRANK T. HAMILTON	GEORGE W. HOLDREGE
WILLIAM WALLACE	FRED A. NASH
JOHN A. MUNROE	NELSON H. LOOMIS
FRANK BOYD	EDSON RICH
GERRIT FORT	FRANK B. JOHNSON
JOSEPH BARKER	THOMAS C. BYRNE
EDWARD P. PECK	REV. THOS. J. MACKAY
HENRY W. YATES	REV. JOHN WILLIAMS

HOW NEIGHBORING SUFFRAGE STATES WARN NEVADA

THE following letter was sent by the Nevada Association of Women Opposed to Equal Suffrage to the President, the Governor of Nevada and the senators and representatives in Congress from Nevada. The letter bears date of July 3, 1914.

At a meeting of the Nevada Association of Women Opposed to Equal Suffrage, the State Chairman was directed to communicate to the President, the Governor, the senators and representative from Nevada their protest against the proposed extension of the franchise to women by amendment to the Federal Constitution. The reasons prompting this protest are:

We believe the strength of the Nation lies in the home and the family. We find the leaders in every element of society opposed to these institutions urging women into politics. We find these leaders in recognized positions of conspicuous leadership in the movement for equal suffrage. If their reasoning be sound, their success means to us the weakening, if not the downfall of the home, the family and the nation, regardless of the views of many good women supporting the movement.

In Colorado, the only State where time, population and general conditions have afforded a test, we find, after twenty years, a disappointment for every promise. In lieu of government we find anarchy; in lieu of order, chaos; in lieu of home rule, Federal control; in lieu of economy in government, the highest per capita tax rate of any State; we find, with but two exceptions, its capital and principal city with the highest per capita expense of those in its class; in lieu of improved domestic conditions we find but two States in forty-eight with a higher divorce rate; we find the social evil aggravated, not abated.

Few women pay taxes. The proposed amendment would multiply the proportion of non-tax-paying voters and practically double the number of those who could vote away the income and further tax the women already taxed, without themselves sharing the burden.

In nine States women now have the full franchise. If the experience of Colorado is to be the experience of the other eight States, it will be and should be rejected by those States which examine first and approve afterward, and no State or group of States should force this experiment upon another. If the claims in its behalf be confirmed by experience its adoption by general consent will follow, welcomed by the women of Nevada as of other States.

The only preferential or test vote in any State by which the women could express their own wish was in Massachusetts in 1895, where 22,204 out of an estimated total of 850,000, or 1 in 38, expressed a desire for the franchise. Two other States already had equal suffrage by the votes of men.

We are informed that Congress has been petitioned "in the name of the women of Nevada" and that the President has been urged to advocate an extension of the franchise by amendment of the Federal Constitution, notwithstanding the fact that the last three and most representative and populous States voting on the question, Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan, have recorded their vote against it by majorities approximating 90,000 each.

We are advised that after a most strenuous and expensive campaign covering many months these petitions, assuming to voice the sentiments of the womanhood of Nevada, bore the signatures of "more than 500 women." There are more than 17,000 white women in Nevada over the age of 21 years. Less than 1 in 34 have petitioned Congress, and we deny the right of these 500 women to speak for the 17,000, or the right of 1 in 34 to speak, without consent, for the other 33 on a subject so vitally affecting the State, the family and the home.

We deny that either the right of franchise or the equality of franchise is an inherent right or that any government has so treated it. Few governments have even uniformity of franchise in either sex or as between sexes. Congress is asked by 1 in 34 of the women of Nevada to enlist the power of the other 47 States to enfranchise and "emancipate" the entire 17,000 women

of this State, while 103,761 men and 116,148 women over the age of 21 years in the District of Columbia look on and continue to be taxed without protest on four times the valuation of Nevada and live in "bondage" without even a vote for school trustee or an expressed desire for one.

In the six States having equal franchise in 1912 a fraction more than 19 per cent. of the women of voting age voted, or less than 1 in 5. Many of these, we believe, would have preferred to leave the activities of politics and the responsibilities of government with the sex that evolved and developed this Republic. They voted in "self defense."

We have seen that in States where women have the franchise those of radical tendencies, the least attached to the home, the least in sympathy with our institutions, voting in largest numbers. One national organization avowedly hostile to our present plan of government and composed largely of persons of foreign birth is active and unanimous in support of the proposed amendment. This organization recently presented as a candidate for mayor of the second, if not the largest, city in California one of its members at that time engaged in the defense of two murderous conspirators against organized society and the reign of law. Both are now in prison on their own confessions of guilt. They were concerned in a nation-wide conspiracy involving destruction of life and property, the plans of the conspiracy extending even to the Panama Canal. Twenty-one lives were sacrificed and more than thirty convictions followed. Less than 20 per cent. of the women of voting age in California vote at any election and frequently less than 5 per cent. Of the voters of Los Angeles at the national election nearest in date only 13 per cent. were Socialists, yet 45 per cent. of the women voting at that municipal election, according to the Socialist leaders, voted for that candidate whose nomination was prompted by his defense of the McNamara brothers. The majority of women, upon whom the franchise was thrust by a minority of the men at the instance of a minority of the women, refrained from voting. In view of this condition, a natural one, which we could not change if we would, we believe the battle of the ballot, as the battle of the sword, is still man's battle.

Very respectfully,

MRS. J. W. ADAMS,
State Chairman.

MRS. FRED STADTMULLER,
Secretary.

"FREE FROM ALL LIMITATIONS OF LAW AND CUSTOM"

By MRS. A. J. GEORGE

THE doctrine of the feminist is heard in our land. Mothers, fathers, teachers and clergymen throughout the country have become aroused to the fact that among the young people this feminist doctrine so noisily heralded abroad is taking hold. Many young girls who have but a passing and indifferent interest in votes for women, to whom that is but a rather dry academic question, are being captivated by the feminist discussion. Home life is now really in danger because of these pernicious teachings of the need of woman's social independence of man. This is no false cry of "Wolf! Wolf!"—the wolf is at hand, even though he wears sheep's clothing. Let any mother review to herself the character of the conversation she may hear almost any day among the young girls about her. She may not be able to recognize at first hand the outcroppings of the feminist doctrine, but she is certain to hear conversations which show the changing ideal of social conduct among our young women.

The feminist movement has ceased to be a mere articulated bugaboo dangled in the dusk to affright the timorous. It is an actuality, and its high priests are spreading the doctrine on all sides.

Whether we like to admit it or not, the woman suffrage question, as originally understood, is becoming the feminist problem instead. All over the country there are thousands of earnest home-making and home-loving women who are working under the old inspiration and with whom the right to vote means the actual goal of their ambitions.

But scattered everywhere are others more active, alert and aggressive, to whom the franchise is only incidental, who are reaching out not only for political equality with men, but for sex freedom and a release from old duties and responsibilities.

Enrolled in this group, which is the smaller by many thousands it must be said, are many of the publicists, the speakers who figure on suffrage platforms and who stand in the public eye for the suffrage-feminist doctrine. Preaching extraordinary teachings of a kind certain to arouse a morbid interest, they are capturing the so-called "woman's rights" movement, and it will be only a question of time when they will dominate it.

American men and women to-day are being aroused for the first time to the extraordinary transformation which is going on by which the suffrage cause, dignified by such women as Mrs. Julia Ward Howe—a movement which aimed for an opportunity for greater public service so that the homes might be sweeter and holier—is being changed into a sex demonstration.

It is the appreciation of the growth of the feminist sentiment and the coalition with the organized Socialistic party, whose representatives march shoulder to shoulder with Suffragists in their parades, which is now resulting in a great quickening of the anti-suffrage movement. Minus the soap-box, the gasoline torch and the street-corner activities, anti-suffrage ranks are steadily increasing because of the alliance of women who wish to protest against this development of feminist teaching.

Under the auspices of suffrage leagues, some of the most pronounced feminist leaders have been given the freedom of their platforms, and it is a reasonably fair conclusion that the invitations conveyed at least a semi-endorsement of the feminist cause. Max Eastman has been a favorite speaker under the folds of the yellow banner. Max Eastman, it may be said in passing, was the presiding officer at a recent I. W. W. meeting at which William Haywood made the outrageously seditious suggestion that his followers paralyze the hand of President Wilson in the Mexican trouble by creating a general strike throughout the country. It was Max Eastman who praised Haywood as "one of America's most poetic souls." Mr. Eastman, who, as has been said, is a much honored speaker at suffrage gatherings, has this view of the new life for women: "Women should be free from all the limitations of law, of dogma and of custom. I know that women are going to grow in a new way."

Charlotte Perkins Stetson Gilman, formerly an associate editor of the official suffrage organ published in Boston, has no time to waste on the mere vote. Here is her own statement of what she hopes to bring about: "Human beings believe their duty is far outside of being mothers; even a kitten could be a mother. This new freedom," she goes on to say, "is a highly diversified social service for one's own family. A male clerk poring all day over his dreary column of figures may not realize it, but his drudgery is higher than any service his wife may perform in her household kitchen."

Let it not be forgotten also that American Suffragists contributed $20,000 last November to the Pankhurst war-chest. This money, no doubt, is being used for the purchase of hatchets, bombs and railroad fares for the arson squad. That contribution was officially encouraged and the donors are certainly getting

their money's worth, while Christabel Pankhurst preaches the doctrine of the economic independence of all women.

In addition to these teachings we have the doctrines of Inez Milholland, who, according to press reports, condemns wedding rings as "relics of barbarism." "I should feel like a slave instead of a free woman," says this herald of suffrage parades, "if I were to wear a wedding ring." Mrs. Florence Wise declares that she believes only in voluntary motherhood. "There are many persons, men as well as women, who are better off without children. Many unmarried women, on the other hand, want children, and there ought to be an opportunity for the expression of their innate mother love."

These doctrines are poisoning the minds of our young girls, who, as any casual observer will tell you, talk blithely of greater freedom of divorce and declare their belief in the so-called "sex rights" of women.

It may be argued that after all they were free platforms from which these would-be leaders expounded their theories of woman's relation to society, and that therefore no real responsibility attaches to those who invited them to speak. Yet the official organ of the Suffragists, which at intervals is hawked upon street corners by attractive young girls, prints liberal extracts from the utterances of these men and women, and with apparent enthusiasm.

The feminist program is being taught with a freedom which is terrifying. In the feminist movement there is little chance for the mother-woman to be heard. Everywhere it is the child-free woman who fills the public eye with her activities. Well does an English writer observe that the theory of the feminist that women should no longer be protected and that we ought all to dwell in the windy open would destroy the structure which we have built for the conservation of woman and the protection of the child. "A few more strokes of these feminist hatchets on the already weakened bars," she writes, "and man *will* be free, and woman will have to begin her work all over again. Because she cannot range freely alongside men in the open. The little hands of children pull her down."

Which promises the greater security to society, an intensifying of the old ideal of womanhood or the championing of writers such as George Creel and Will Irwin, who assure us that there are "limits to the possibilities of that sacred institution of motherhood of which so much bunk has been said and written"? The harm which may come out of all this cannot be over-estimated. That the home is in danger cannot be denied. The fact that the notoriety-seeking craze is reaching our young girls and women and unsettling them cannot be ignored. Fortunately for all, there is a hope that the very extreme of the doctrine and the visible evidences of its effect will hinder its course.

American women to-day have a great question to ask themselves. Which do you want the more, the vote or the home? The feminist movement abolishes the home, and casually throws in the vote in exchange.

WHEN ABSTRACT THEORY MEETS PRACTICAL POLITICS

THE following letter was written by a resident of Tacoma, Wash., a man who has lived for twenty-five years in that State and has been a judge of its superior court for eight years. The letter was addressed to Mrs. Thomas Allen, a member of the Executive Committee of the Boston, Mass., Anti-Suffrage Association:

DEAR MADAM:

Replying to your inquiry concerning woman suffrage in the State of Washington, I will say the State of Washington has had such a Bryanite and Roosevelted shampoo of legislation by the lady barbers of woman suffrage that it has become a serious question of how many such "treatments" the State can stand and not go into bankruptcy. We have woman suffrage, the initiative, the referendum, the recall, the direct primary, the workmen's compensation act, the eight-hour-a-day law, the minimum wage scale, inspectors and commissions almost without number, mothers' pensions, the lazy husband law and the commission form of city government. We have more eggs in the incubator. Under the initiative ten more laws called "The Ten Sisters," including prohibition, are about to be voted on by electors at an expenditure of over one-half million dollars, and women's clubs are still in session.

Abstractly a woman has the same right to vote as a man and a man has the same right to keep house and mend socks as a woman, but this suffrage question is not one of abstract rights, but is a question simply of public expediency.

I voted for woman suffrage because I thought she had the same right to vote as a man and her vote would uplift politics, but I am now convinced that the State of Washington needed a more restrictive, elective franchise rather than extending the franchise still more generally by including the women of the State. When we gave women the vote we enfranchised the wife and daughter, who were no more fit to cast the ballot than the man from whom the ballot should have been taken away. Now that we have a large woman vote it is just that much more difficult to get a restricted ballot upon an educational or property qualification or some other sane government protecting her citizens in life, liberty, property and due process of law, the things for which our forefathers fought and gave their lives.

In Washington we have found that the same motives that control the ballot in men control it in women. The mercenary element is just as strong. Women are hired to do political work at so much per day just the same as men are hired, and at a cheaper figure, especially about spring-bonnet time. The same spirit of selfishness controls women as men in their ballot, and they look forward to securing "an appointment" for themselves or some member of their family in return for their political activity just as men do, and they get their reward too. There are candidates for office actuated by the same motives as men with no higher regard for the public than that of men. Women are divided on all public questions just as men are, and on all moral questions as well. They are as vacillating in their judgments as men. In Seattle the women tied up with the ministers and secured the recall of Hi Gill and then when he became a candidate for the same office at the next election women gave him their hearty support and re-elected him. At Tacoma the women tied up with the saloon element and secured the recall of Mayor Fawcett and then when he became a candidate for re-election went out through the city and gave him their support and re-elected him to the same office. They are sentimental. The moral and religious instinct is stronger than in men, but not to such an universal extent as to predominate sufficiently to control the results in our elections. The ballot has a tendency to unsex women and make them more like men in their daily intercourse with men and in their contact with public affairs, which lamentably often carries them away from the sphere in which we have been so proud to honor them. If the question was submitted to women alone and every woman was compelled to vote I believe woman suffrage would be strongly defeated in Washington. Many wives and domestic women say: "This vote is a nuisance," and many will not vote, while others vote from self-defense to offset the vote of the undesirable women who do vote.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) E. B. SNELL.

How the Press Regards Mr. Bryan's Statement

(Editorial in New York *Sun*, July 18, 1914)

INFORMATION has never been a weakness of Mr. Bryan's and he is richly comic when he attributes the tardiness of his conversion to woman suffrage to his search for information and his occupation—in the hours spared him by Chautauqua—by national questions. If he sought light he hasn't found it. He rehearses feebly the old arguments. And what shall be thought of his apparently original thesis that there is more "organization and enthusiasm" among the pros than the antis, argal, the former are right?

Poor stuff, and this of the poorest. "I am not in doubt as to my duty," he says. Not now, when there are nine States on his side and the West is particularly full of organization and enthusism. Not now, when some or many of the Suffragists are cold to Mr. Wilson.

Woman suffrage gets no real strength from the adherence of this veteran champion of humbug. From no politician, indeed, can one side or the other get any strength. Most of the politicians are playing their own game. They don't care a rap about the merits. Will it pay them to come out for votes for women? Were the antis better organized they might have commanded Mr. Bryan's noble aid.

To the friends of woman suffrage the only value of Mr. Bryan's buttery commendation is that it shows how he thinks the cat will jump. Brother Bryan is usually wrong.

(Editorial in the *Evening Post* of Louisville, Ky., July 17, 1914)

WE cannot find in Mr. Bryan's argument for woman suffrage anything that is new or convincing. It consists in the statement that "I am unwilling to accept political rights denied to my wife."

Whether Mrs. Bryan would be a better voter than Mr. Bryan we do not know, but there is no question of "right" involved. In that phrase Mr. Bryan goes astray and loses himself in a muddle of sentiment about the mother's devotion to her children and widows' care of property.

Our government is a government by discussion. The discussion begins at the fireside and is concluded in the halls of legislation.

Under the representative system the conclusion, after discussion, is recorded by men over twenty-one years of age.

The age limit is purely arbitrary, for no doubt many young men under twenty-one are more competent to decide public questions than many older ones who vote, but somewhere a line has to be fixed, and it is fixed at twenty-one.

Again, this service is assigned solely to the man, first, because, from the nature of his daily labors, he is better qualified, as a rule, to decide matters of government, matters affecting the public welfare. He is more impersonal in his decisions and he knows more fully the effect of any decision.

Mr. Bryan denies this. He thinks "his wife" is as well qualified as he and more devoted than he to the welfare of their children.

That is not the point. The proposition is not to enfranchise Mrs. Bryan, but to enfranchise every woman in Nebraska, over the protest of a majority of women. It is to impose a new task on the overtaxed half of the human family. It doubles the franchise, but not by one iota does it alter the proportion between the good and the bad; the wise and the ignorant; the sane and the insane.

The women to-day are represented wherever the forces of government shape themselves; represented in person, or by father, son, brother or friend, at the ballot box, in the vote on legislation, the decrees of the courts as fully, fairly and effectively as the individual man is represented.

All the hopes based on woman suffrage are vain delusions. The ballot has none of the miraculous power attributed to it. If women were unanimous on any proposition, or on every proposition, they would not by the ballot, by legislation in the next fifty years accomplish more for women and children than has been accomplished in the past fifty years.

If it is said much of this good is due to woman we will grant it; due to woman's influence, not to woman's ballot.

All that man has accomplished by thought, organization, argument, agitation and ballot has been shared equally by woman. They rise and fall together. Women's wages rise with men's wages, and more protection is put around the woman laborer and the woman criminal than about men, for no good, moral, physical, financial, social or political movement amounts to anything until it is recorded in improved conditions in family life.

Any other conception, any other hope, any other aspiration is a delusion; harmless when it affects only a few; ruinous when it sweeps away the barriers erected against the emotional actions of a hynotized crowd, by the wise men and women of all generations.

(*Special to The World.*)

Omaha, Neb., July 28.—The chief feature of the Democratic State Convention, held to-day at Columbus, was the defeat of W. J. Bryan and his brother, Charles W. Bryan, in their effort to prevent the resolutions passed by the convention from containing a laudatory mention of the name of Senator G. M. Hitchcock.

The first test of strength came on the election of a secretary to the State Committee, in which the Hitchcock candidate won by a vote of 649 to 431.

"We Do Not Wish to Be Governed by Women Who Misrepresent Us"

ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS believe that in democracy the majority should rule; and so long as Suffragists remain a very small fraction of the population they should not be allowed to force suffrage upon the women of the State. At the recent hearing at the State House a Suffragist stated that the Massachusetts Suffrage Association has 40,000 members. This includes both men and women, and as the *Woman's Journal* announced a few weeks ago that a newborn infant had just been enrolled as a member of the organization, it is possible that many such are included in the 40,000. But for the sake of argument let us generously count them all, men, women and babies, as women over 21 capable of casting a vote. The female population of Massachusetts is 1,131,000. Deduct the 40,000 and you have 1,091,000 left. Is it fair that such an enormous number should have suffrage forced upon them against their will? "Oh," says the Suffragist, "you needn't vote if you don't want to, but you mustn't prevent me from voting." But she misses the whole point of the matter. It is not only that we do not wish to vote, but that we do not wish to be governed by a class of women who would so totally misrepresent us. The Suffragists and the Anti-Suffragists are as wide apart as the poles on many fundamental ideals of life. Why, therefore, should 1,091,000 Non-Suffragists be represented at the polls by 40,000 Suffragists? There is a type of female politician arising already in Massachusetts, unscrupulous, believing that the end justifies almost any means. If the men of Massachusetts believe in fair play they will refuse to force the burden of political life upon all the women of the State because a very small fraction think they want it.

The Mighty "I"; The All-Important "Me"; First Understudy for the Deity

By Florence Goff Schwarz

In that blest time when all the world was young,
Its prayers unchanted and its songs unsung,
Dame Nature with glad harp and silver lute
Entranced her subjects, all save man—the brute.
For him to roam at will; to hunt, to slay
Made the full routine of his aimless day.
Behind her lord and master, lowly bowed,
His comrade meekly followed, shrinking, cowed.
For her a dreary round of endless toil;
For her to hew the wood and till the soil,
To tread the shadowed way with bated breath,
That pain-scorched avenue which leads to death,
And then to struggle back from death's alarms,
Bearing her child—and his—in trembling arms.
'Twas thus she sensed, thro' toil and pain and loss,
The *via dolorosa* of the cross.
There, whelmed within the undertow of life
The chemic broil of death and birth and strife,
Into her soul had crept a strange new scheme
Thrillingly sweet—warm with the mother-dream,
And in the aeons of a world to be
She glimpsed far reaches of her destiny.
She canceled from her life the word "despair,"
That Hope's bright torch might burn more clearly there.
With dauntless courage born of inner grace
She stepped beside her lord and claimed her place.
The brute within the man resigned control,
Shamed by the pure reflection of her soul,
And recognized that only those are strong
Who sacrifice and suffer over-long.
E'en though she bore the cruel scars of such
Yet tenderness untold was in her touch.
"I would protect," she said, "each child I bear
From toil and sorrow which hath been my share."
As time wore on still with sure feet she stood
A sovereign spirit for supremest good,
And from the crucible of centuries
A world was drawn to worship at her knees.
Her children knew not sacrifice, alas!
And so a new régime hath come to pass.
Behold the pampered daughter of the race,
What priceless charm hath vanished from her face!
With wisdom culled from Cleopatra's lore,
Flouting with scorn the sacred truths of yore,
Drunken with deadly Upas draughts of power,
She stakes her all upon the present hour;
The past is *nil* and man is less than naught,
Ignored are all the marvels he hath wrought.
The mighty "I," the all-important "Me,"
First understudy for the Deity.
"My rights, my rights," the burden of her song,
E'en though these rights may mean another's wrong.
To shape herself by some new wondrous plan,
To grapple with her lord as "Man with Man";
This is her *casus belli*—this her scheme—
Gone is the love and gone the mother-dream.
The blessed household voices all are mute,
Dulled by the raucous clamor of dispute;
Gone, too, is chivalry, for equal rights
Means equal courtesies and—equal slights
And burdens from which we are now exempt
To court the freedom that must breed contempt.
Lost is that higher law by which we gained,
Self-seekers must be ever non-sustained,
And no philosophy can hope to last
Unless upheld by precepts of the past.
We shudder lest the future years shall trace
The godless retrogression of a race.

HOW WOMEN REALLY VOTE IN SUFFRAGE STATES

BECAUSE of reckless claims and statements made regarding conditions in woman suffrage States, the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association has started a study of actual conditions.

This step was agreed on at the last meeting of the executive committee when it was found that notwithstanding the lack of accurate information as to the number of women voting and registering in many of the Western States, claims are being spread abroad that from 80 to 90 per cent. of the women eligible were voting.

Circular letters have been sent to many of the State and city officials asking for statements. The first contribution has come from Boise City, Idaho, and the writer does not mince his words in describing conditions:

"From the experience here very few women comparatively use the right to vote, and only do so under the guidance of their husbands and in most instances have very little knowledge of the subject they are called upon to exercise their right. This is not from the fact that they are not capable, but that they do not wish to be bothered, their home requires their attention, and unless there is an automobile or a nice team at the door to convey them to the polling station, they positively would not stir out.

"Then again, where women are really active in this matter it causes much trouble in the home life. A business man of our town and his wife wrangled for days over the questions and finally were hardly on speaking terms, owing to the fact that they could not agree and voted differently. This is only one instance, but there are many more of a similar nature.

"On Mondays they won't vote because it is 'Wash Day'; on Tuesdays because it's 'Baking Day'; on Wednesdays because it's 'Club Day'; on Thursdays because it's 'At Home Day,' and so forth and so on, and really I cannot see what good is accomplished when they really, or perhaps I should say the vast majority, don't know or care what they are voting about, for the simple reason that if they have a home and a family to care for their time is really occupied to the very limit. Those who do exercise their right and take an active part neglect entirely all those home duties for days and are absent for hours at a time from their children, who usually suffer considerably.

"I have heard many say: 'Well, I shall not vote unless they send for me and take me in an auto'; and I have even known women there to refuse to go to the polls because a buggy was sent for them instead of an auto. The truth is they are not at all concerned about who are elected, for the reason that they do not have time to study the questions as thoroughly as they should in order to cast an 'interested vote.'"

AN OLD-TIME SUFFRAGIST TO HER HIKING SISTERS

AN old-time Suffragist to her up-to-date, hiking, street-parading sisters: From *The Congresswoman*, by Isabel Gordon Curtis.

"Sometimes I have a feelin'"—she hesitated for a moment as if searching in her mind for a simile—"that I'm like the little boy who punched a hole in one o' them Dutch dykes that they build to keep out the ocean. He set by lookin' at the water trickle out. At first there wan't no more'n he could have lapped up; but the hole kep' growin' an' growin' till there was considerable of a stream. He clapped his hand over the leak an' started to holler for help. 'Twan't no use. He couldn't keep the tide back. Then he ran. The last seen of him he was leggin' it for dear life with the hull Atlantic Ocean at his heels. That's the way," explained the old woman abruptly, "I feel sometimes about suffrage. The awful part of it is, the boy who punched the hole in the dyke wan't the only one who was swept off when the Atlantic come roarin' in."

"I've got you women here," she continued, "an' I want you to listen, even if you don't agree with me. Men set still and hear themselves scalped without raisin' a yap. You're frettin' against what you call the thraldom of sex; if that's so, act now as men would. One anti come out with the statement that our parade was a blazin' indiscretion. I'm not dead sure but she was right. While I looked on that fool parade I felt pretty much like the young one who set the Atlantic Ocean free. Mine was one of the hands that made a hole in the dyke, I confess to that. Only it wan't given me to look into the future. The spirit of thirty-six years ago ain't no more like your goin's-on in this twentieth century than our modern world's like Puritan New England.

"In them days home come *first* an' suffrage was a side issue. We did the work that was up to us and wouldn't be sidestepped. We made the best o' what we had and just kep' hopin' for better days. We bore children cheerfully and lovin'ly. We reared them as tenderly an' wisely we knew how, toilin' for them from mornin' till night with never a thought that such toil was a hardship or an injustice. Our highest ideal, I reckon, was to make home the happiest, cleanest, most comfortable, most comfortin' place on earth. You women wouldn't call that a very high ideal, only the modernistic female hadn't been heared of in them days.

"I knew you wouldn't like what I had to say."

"Remember," she pleaded, "'tain't a man that's lambastin' you. It's one woman talkin' to another, an old woman, who knows the worst an' the best of her own sex. You're all stirred up over that fool parade, only you wan't to blame half as much as the monumental donkey that cooked up the freak idea. If you know who she is, you'd ought to take her out behind the barn an' dress her down with a buggy whip. I had my opinion of her, I can tell you, as I set an' watched you strut past. When you come to a halt an' set free your dove o' peace after all the scrappin' an' the little picayune jealousies you'd been indulgin' in, it was enough to throw every wooden Indian along the street into a giggle. I don't suppose you've heared where your dove lighted down, only I reckon the papers got ahead of it with their story of tumult an' heart-burnin'. If you'd a grain o' humor in you you'd have cut out that dove business. There were other things in the parade besides the dove that makes the country set back an' do some thinkin'.

"For the love of our homes an' our country an' our children, won't each one o' you go home to-night an' do some thinkin'? How many of you really care a whoop for the welfare o' women? You talk o' posterity an' givin' posterity its political freedom! What's political freedom goin' to amount to if you mothers hand down snarked nerves, memories of a home where neglect an' ferment an' agitation reigned supreme, where a father was condemned as a tyrant or a weaklin', where a daughter was taught to look at her brother an' the whole masculine sex as her born enemies? That sort o' thing's goin' down an' down through generations, so it seems to me almost like some strain o' disease. You know it as well as I do but you don't dare face it or—confess it.

"Ahead o' wealth or honor or power come home an' the happiness of home, your duty to the man you made a vow to, an' the children you've brought into the world. You think you can do this an' rush round agitatin' suffrage into the bargain. You can't. You're bitin' off more'n you can chew. If you bring up a future voter who'll do his duty as ably and honestly as he knows how an' train a daughter to take up a woman's job—an' believe me it's as noble as any job God hands out—then you're a power an' not the near-imbecile you say you're likened to. I heard one fool, a man you lassoed into your ranks—you see I allow there are some fool men—say he unconsciously holds his mother in such contempt as to class her with convicts or imbeciles—until she gets a vote. My soul! do you know what you are doing to our cause—for I still call it our cause—when you take in a man that's capable of sayin' sich a thing as that just to give him five cents' worth o' cheap notoriety?

"Are any of you willin' to turn back and stand with the few of us who believe in old-fashioned peace and womanliness? If there are some who aren't ashamed to allow we made a mistake somewhere back an' begin again, I'm ready to step alongside of you. If I've got to give up every shred o' dignity I hang onto an' dress up like a circus performer, or preach from a cart tail on the street, just to get what's comin' to me, or spend any time racin' all over creation wavin' a banner, or spoutin' high-falutin' speeches that I don't understand and don't have a mite o' faith in, then"—the old woman's voice choked huskily—"then I reckon we've come to the partin' of the ways. I'm goin' home."

They Never Signed a "Will and Won't" Pledge

THE ladies who want to get into office on the strength of Jeanne d'Arc and Florence Nightingale's services to their country ought to follow the example of these great women and they would have no trouble. If a feminist will win back Alsace-Lorraine to France or devote herself to the sick and dying it is certain that they will meet their reward either with Jeanne d'Arc's martyrdom and beatification or Florence Nightingale's apotheosis. But neither Jeanne d'Arc nor Florence Nightingale were ever office-seekers. Both were followers of a divine example. Florence Nightingale never deserted her post to get up a feminist regiment. She stayed where she was needed and without "equal pay for equal work" forever on her lips, for she received no salary, but, on the contrary, devoted her entire private income to the needs of the hospitals. Jeanne d'Arc received no reward but the success of her patriotic mission. If it is possible to conceive of either of these women clamoring for office and emolument it would be easy to imagine that they might be elected by acclamation unless, as is likely, they considered the whole position *infra dig.* The dignity of woman is greater than that of man. Only the second-rate woman is the office-seeker.

Feminists think they have discovered a new religion, but they have only found the old Gospel of Self. The Gospel of Self was one of the most primitive of religions and dates from B. C.

Militant Outrages Paid for by Suffragists

"I DOUBT if a single outrage is committed by a woman who is not paid."—Reginald McKenna, Home Secretary of England.

The New York Times of July 5, 1914, contained evidence supporting Mr. McKenna's statement. It said:

Following the latest raid on Suffragist headquarters and the seizure of various documents therein, the authorities have discovered that there is a definite tariff paid for all acts of violence. The clue to the discovery was a receipt showing that the woman who slashed the Velasquez last winter received $250 for her act. From other papers seized it is shown that a sliding scale of payment exists for the commission of various offenses against the law.

For annoying certain Cabinet Ministers "herein designated" sums ranging from $5 to $10 have been paid. Church service interruptions are cheaper, ranging from $1 to $5, according to the nature of the act. The creation of disturbances in places of amusement cost the Suffragist treasury all the way from $5 to $10. Arson and bomb outrages come high at from $300 to $500, while the King or Queen may be insulted at $5 an insult, or $25 if the insult leads to a demonstration.

How many militant outrages were made possible by the twenty thousand dollars that Mrs. Pankhurst was reported to have taken back to England after her last visit to this country?

NOTES ON MILITANCY

A woman signing herself Mabel Cotterell urges the British nation to put in a claim against the Suffragettes for twenty thousand pounds for destruction of the Rokeby Venus.

A militant makes the startling announcement: "We have been too ladylike in the past!" Where? And when?

Militants have been taking drugs to make themselves ill and at the same time invoking the prayers of the congregations against the "torture of women." Self-inflicted torture is easily remedied without assistance from outside.

Father Bowden, describing the appearance of the women who interrupted the services at Brompton Oratory, says: "They looked like epileptics, with gaping mouths, wild eyes, contorted features. I went on reading the Pastoral, pausing every now and then when the uproar was at its worst."

A militant shouted in the dock, "We have no King, but thank God we have Mrs. Pankhurst!" "You pays your money and you takes your choice."

Mr. Marshall, of the firm of Hatchett Jones, Bisgood and Marshall, solicitors, who has heretofore defended the Suffragettes in all their cases, has notified them that in the future he will have nothing further to do with them. This is a result of the use made of the firm's clerk who carried dangerous drugs to the hunger strikers. It was stated in his defense that he was tricked into a breach of prison regulations by the militants—nevertheless, being a mere man, he was obliged to pay a fine of ten pounds and costs. Mr. Marshall's experience should be a lesson to lawyers who defend bad actions, even with chivalrous intent.

Somebody ruthlessly suggests that the way to cure militancy is to give women equal treatment with men. That is what Suffragists clamor for, but no one dares to put it into practise. Equality is, of course, the last thing they want. It is also exactly what they ought to get.

"The wild women are endeavoring by a persistent scheme of mean crime to obtain a privilege which the country is not willing to grant them. * * * Their sex gives them privileges, of which even the most demented fury cannot divest herself, and all that need be said about the kind of warfare they wage is that the vast majority of women are heartily ashamed of it."—*London Daily Mail*, June 4, 1914.

The New York Times of July 4, in commenting on the performance of the Suffragists who tried to heckle the President, calls attention to the fact that "there are two kinds of Suffragists in this country. One is akin to the militant Suffragettes of England and is simply aching for an excuse to introduce militant methods in America." This is especially significant, as Alice Paul, the head of the Congressional Union, under whose auspices the delegation visited the President, has been in prison in England, and Rheta Child Dorr, who tried to heckle the President, came over with Mrs. Pankhurst, stayed with her at Ellis Island, and was her lieutenant while in this country.

Miss Lavinia Dock, a prominent New York Suffragist, says: "The English militants are superb! They have great organization, calm and absolute courage, utter forgetfulness of self. The militants had £20,000 more given them this winter to spend for the cause than ever before. For skill and intellect and finesse and passion they have the French Revolution beaten a thousand miles."

An Attempt to Alter Laws of Nature

ADMIRAL A. T. MAHAN, introducing Mrs. Frank J. Goodwin at a meeting on Long Island July 15th, said: "It has been said that, owing to Great Britain having no written Constitution as a check upon the powers of her legislature, there is nothing which Parliament cannot do, except to make a woman a man. To define this object as the end of the suffrage movement would probably be called a caricature; yet a moment's reflection will show that it is true, in the sense of breaking down and removing forever the line of demarcation, which the general sense of the world and the course of history have drawn, as the barrier separating the respective spheres of men and women. It is obvious that the movement cannot stop, with the mere grant of the vote; that logically and inevitably it goes on to the full entrance of women upon the whole field of political activity; upon the legislative field, from the National Congress down, and upon the Executive, from the President of the United States to the smallest political office in the gift of the government.

This is not to establish merely equality of consideration, upon which so much argument is based, with the implication that the withholding of suffrage is an imputation of the inferiority of women to men. The result, stated above as inevitable, if the vote be once obtained, is not *equality* in any sense, but *identity* of social function between men and women. It means that women shall no longer concentrate their ambitions and affections upon the home, the children and all the sacred relationships attaching to these words, but shall disperese their energies and modify their characters and their entire personalities as a sex by entering upon the outside hurly-burly of masculine life.

The question before us then is whether it is, or can be, good for the community to sacrifice, wholly or even in great measure, the special social function of woman, which throughout the Christian era has been hers in the Christian household. The equality of the sexes has been the teaching of Christianity from the beginning; and nowhere else than where Christianity enters has that equality been found, because women have neither the physical nor the moral energy to compel it by brute force. Is it probably for the good of the community? Because the true test to be applied to *every* social and political demand is the good of the community; not the gratification of a very small section of it—which the Suffragists now are.

A Rhetorical Gem From a Suffrage Organ

From "The Craziest State," by Alice Stone Blackwell in the *Woman's Journal*

MASSACHUSETTS has the largest proportion of insane persons to its population of any State in the Union. This fact is revealed by Government figures lately made public. Massachusetts likewise has the oldest anti-suffrage association in the United States. It is clear, therefore, that the existence of an anti-suffrage association tends to promote insanity. The people of Massachusetts have evidently been driven crazy by reading the weird and fantastic arguments against equal rights for women which the Antis have been scattering broadcast for a long series of years.

At least that is the sort of inference which the Anti-Suffragists would have drawn if the largest proportion of insanity had been found in Wyoming, where women have voted longer than anywhere else in the Union. But Wyoming ranks well in that respect. Some years ago, when the Anti-Suffragists came out with one of their periodical prophecies that the ballot would wreck women's nervous systems and cause an increase of insanity, investigation showed that in all Wyoming there were only three insane persons, and those three happened to be men.

This *post hoc propter hoc* method of argument, so dear to the Anti-Suffragists, might easily be carried farther, and would yield some surprising results. In every State which has had an anti-suffrage association for a considerable number of years there has been a marked increase of divorces since the anti-suffrage organization was started. Evidently anti-suffrage associations promote divorce. It has been said that the anti-suffrage ladies "seem to hold a brief against their own sex." At any rate, they habitually run down women. As a large majority of divorces are granted on account of the misconduct of husbands, it is clear that the husbands read the anti-suffrage literature, imbibed from it a contempt for women, and proceeded to show that contempt by deserting, beating or otherwise ill-treating their wives.

Since in almost every city where an anti-suffrage association exists there is a steady increase of juvenile crime, it is evident that mothers let their offspring run wild while they are away from home attending anti-suffrage meetings. Once started on this line of argument, any intelligent person can continue to draw "the deadly parallel" indefinitely.

NOW that we have been set this example, we might apply the same idea to the claim that "1,000,000 club women endorse woman suffrage" because a few hundred representatives not empowered to express the opinions of their home clubs endorsed suffrage. We might go on and say, by the same kind of logic, that because some twenty women claiming to represent the same "1,000,000 club women" "insulted the President of the United States" (Dr. Anna Shaw virtually declared that the twenty did so), *therefore* one million club women "insulted the President of the United States."

The one statement is as logical as the other. The latter is as obviously absurd as the former.

Another Rhetorical Gem of Suffrage

From "Who Is Sylvia?" An Aspect of Feminism, by Alice Duer Miller, *Scribner's Magazine*, July, 1914

IT appears, in any case, that organizations of women do not tend as inevitably to hostility with other organizations as men's have done. It was significant the other day to see the two lower classes of Barnard College sending the proceeds of an entertainment to Wellesley—a rival institution. Not just the interchange most characteristic between our men's universities.

It is this growing co-operation and confidence between women that is giving feminism its strength.

Feminism—for some of us like to rush upon a definition—is the effort to test sex limitations. There was a time when to know how to swim was unfeminine and to carry an umbrella beneath the dignity of man. The object of the test is, of course, to determine which are true and which are false limitations, and to do away with the false.

Laws can be changed and institutions captured, but who can fight against a myriad unexplained predilictions for doing things a certain way? To get them out in the open often gives them new life, and nothing could be more dangerous to the cause of reform than to push any given reform an inch farther than the community approves. A reaction will at once set in and carry it farther back than ever.

Senator Tillman, of South Carolina, says that the chivalry of Southern men will always protect Southern women without the ballot * * *

One wonders if even Southern chivalry is as adequate to protect as women's own vote would be!

Many Suffragists, however, feel that women's demand for the vote has an even deeper reason and one much more difficult to put into words. They feel that the condition of disenfranchisement not only hampers them as citizens, as mothers and as associates of enfranchised men, but in their education, in their own development and—even in their own *thoughts*.

Women Voters Who Do Not Favor Suffrage

(Editorial from *The Record*, Biddeford, Me., July 8, 1914)

MRS. A. J. GEORGE, of Wellesley, writing in the Boston *Herald*, shows up the fallacy of the *Herald's* position that President Wilson's attitude towards women's votes is likely to tell against him in the ten equal suffrage States by pointing out some tendencies in these States.

She quotes from a letter from a registration committee of the California Civic League which urges women to register, and states that out of 100,000 women eligible to citizenship in San Francisco less than 4,000 have registered.

The fact is, as Mrs. George indicates, that while there are ten equal suffrage States the voting women of these States are by no means convinced of the value of woman suffrage. They have no mind to boycott a candidate who has the courage to assert that the nation should not bestow equal suffrage upon the women of all the States at once, whether they desire it or not.

When, as in San Francisco, less than 4,000 out of 100,000 women eligible to citizenship register after the ordinary efforts are made and only 14,000 after the most strenuous efforts are put forth, there is but one interpretation to be put upon the situation, and that it that the women of San Francisco are doubtful of the value of woman suffrage. In Colorado the situation is nearly the same and women who were prominent in the original movement for equal suffrage in Colorado are now found declaring that they doubt the wisdom of it, both because of the small number of women voting and because they have hindered rather than helped reform in that State.

The attitude of President Wilson in opposing a woman suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution is likely to help him rather than tell against him in the equal suffrage States.

When Premier Asquith received the six Suffragettes he welcomed the members of the deputation as representatives of "an association which disassociated itself from the criminal methods of those who have done so much damage and put back the cause of women." He argued that if every woman over twenty-one years of age possessed the vote they would still find legislative problems regarding women exceedingly difficult of solution, in the same way as the men had found them.

"There are things that intelligence alone is able to seek, but which it will never find. These things instinct alone could find, but it will never seek them."—HENRI BERGSON.

REPORTS OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS

DELAWARE

THE Women's Committee of Delaware Opposed to Woman Suffrage have headed their signature papers with the following declaration:

We believe that the further extension of the suffrage to all the women of the State of Delaware is not desired by the majority of them.

We believe that it would involve greater expense at elections with no corresponding benefit either to women or the State.

We believe that the interests of the family and the home are menaced by any further political activities.

As women of Delaware of full voting age, and therefore affected by the proposed change, we subscribe our names as being satisfied with the present non-partisan status of women in our State government: Mrs. Eugene Du Pont, Mary Corbit Warner, Mary Polk Draper, Mary Wilson Thompson, Mrs. James Pennewill, Mrs. Lewis W. Mustard, Mrs. Walter Morris, Mrs. Emma Burnett, Mrs. R. J. Lindale Mrs. Thomas V. Cahall, Mrs. Caleb Burchenal, Mrs. Frederick M. Kinsman, Mrs. Charles L. Reid, Miss Katharine Wilson, Mrs. Josephine W. Bissell, Josephine E. Gilpin, Mrs. Elizabeth B. Bates, Mrs. Preston Lea, Emily P. Bissell, Mrs. Willard Saulsbury, Mrs. George W. Marshall, Mrs. Thomas F. Bayard, Mrs. John Sheldrake, Mrs. George A. Elliott, Mrs. C. C. Fulton, Mrs. George F. Bissell, Mrs. Robert J. Ferguson, Mrs. Robert H. Van Dyke, Mrs. Galt Smith, Miss Amy E. Du Pont, Mrs. F. W. Curtis, Miss Jennie M. Weaver, Mrs. Daniel Short.

GEORGIA

THE Georgia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was organized May 22, 1914, at Hotel Dempsey with 300 members, gotten in three hours. A petition and list of 1,000 names was sent to Senator Hoke Smith and Congressman Bartlett. The majority of this 300 were business women who are strongly opposed. The merchants wished to sign, and some did, but at the last meeting it was decided to suggest "The Business Men's League Opposed to Woman Suffrage" as being preferable.

The Corresponding Secretary has established chairmen of associations in Fort Valley, Montezuma, Tenville, Albany, Wrightsville, Perry, Dublin, Pelham, Quitman, Thomasville, and all Georgia with many parts of Albany are being aroused to the insidiousness of this movement.

The Georgia Legislature has killed the bill in the committee. Our Association sent the President, Miss Caroline Patterson and Mrs. Walter Lamar, Chairman of the Legislative Committee, who, with Miss Mildred Rutherford of Athens represented Georgia's protest. Our legislators are with us, they say.

Two thousand names are on our list and the message comes from all over the State "We will follow Macon's womanhood." A Thomasville matron of 32 writes: "I have been too busy raising voters to think about voting, but I take it if I give to Georgia five good citizens I have prepared five good men to protect five good women, and if they do that they will surely vote for the best laws."

MASSACHUSETTS

AN addition of over 1,000 names to the membership rolls of the Anti-Suffrage Association since June 1st was reported at the joint meeting of the Executive, County, Education and Organization Committees, which was held Friday, July 17th at the headquarters in the Kensington Building in Boston.

Considering that the vacation period is on and the signatures in many cases have been voluntary offerings, this is considered as a very creditable and remarkable record. The chairmen of Branch Committees reported continued activity in their various towns.

The Meetings Committee reported meetings already arranged for July and August at West Townsend, Holden, Hubbardston, South Braintree, Barre, Nahant, Westminster, Arlington, Brockton, Bridgewater, Roslindale, West Acton and Winthrop and many more in prospect. Requests for anti-suffrage speakers from women's clubs throughout the State are being received daily and the autumn program promises to be a very full one.

The chairman of the Public Interests League reported a growing membership, steady demand for literature and a constantly increasing number of visitors. The work done for the Salem sufferers by the league has been acknowledged by letters from Governor Walsh, Mayor Hurley and the various committees to whom shipments were made. Thirty barrels of good, ready-to-wear clothing and nearly $200 in money were contributed by the various branches, and from fifteen to twenty members of the league were on duty the better part of two weeks repairing and packing the clothing.

The advertising committee reported the erection of a large sign which reads "Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association, 15 Milk Street and 687 Boylston Street," just back of the center-field at the Fenway Baseball Park, where it is in full view of more than 20,000 voters daily.

MARYLAND

THE Maryland Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage has been steadily increasing its members and since the first of June has added a few less than 200 names to the list, and this with only one large meeting. For two weeks the first part of June an office was opened on the east side of town, on Broadway. We found that the people were very much in sympathy with the opposition and the result was a hundred names were gained without holding a public meeting and the assurance given that when the question reached the voters, if it does, it would meet defeat by a large majority in that section of the city. It might be added that this is a part of the city where the workingmen live, and they are the voters every time there is an election of any kind.

The main office is located in the center of the financial district, and every day many passersby drop in and add strength and courage to the association by signing their names. The office is open every week day from ten in the morning until five in the afternoon, and the Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot, is there to meet the inquiries and requests of those calling.

Several requests have come from the counties for literature and meetings. The Suffragists had a two weeks' "hike" through Garrett County a few weeks ago, which brought a request from Oakland for something to "offset the possible effect of the 'hike' which was stirring the anti-suffrage spirit into indignant activity." Letters and literature were immediately sent and plans are being formed for a meeting in Oakland, and Miss Marjorie Dorman is to speak at the Mount Lake Park Chautauqua, only two miles away, in August, which gives us every reason to believe that soon Garrett County will have an active branch association.

Harford County has been invaded by the Suffragists, with meetings, the hikers from New York and several auto speech-making trips, which resulted in an invitation to us from Bel Air, the county seat, to hold an anti meeting there, which was held on Saturday evening, July 18th, at the Country Club. The day was perfect, the hall crowded, and people filled the porches and every window and door was filled with heads, as the assembled audience strained their ears to catch the speeches. Judge Harlan, of Bel Air, presided and introduced the speakers, who were Miss Bronson, of New York, and Hon. John A. Matthews, of New Jersey. Miss Bronson was most forceful and convincing, telling the fundamental reasons for opposing suffrage and proving her statements with facts by showing where the enfranchisement of women in the suffrage States had not worked out for the betterment of conditions

of either the State or its women to the satisfaction of nearly all present.

The Secretary of the Maryland Association made a brief address.

The Maryland Association will have booths at the county fairs this fall, where much publicity work will be done and the propaganda spread over the State in this way.

MINNESOTA

THE movement among Minnesota women opposed to the further extension of suffrage antedates any formal organization. It first manifested itself during the session of the State legislature in the winter of 1912 into which had been introduced a bill for the submission of a constitutional amendment providing for woman's suffrage. A few women in the "Twin Cities" and elsewhere undertook a more or less concerted movement in opposition to the proposed legislation. The bill was defeated.

Subsequently an organization was effected with a strong board of officers and directors, including many women prominent socially and in civic endeavor in several of the principal cities of the State. A public meeting, which was largely attended, was held in Minneapolis in the fall of 1913.

Subsequently as the work extended a public meeting was held in St. Paul. Presiding at this meeting was Mr. J. Gilpin Pyle, a well-known writer, and it was addressed by Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, of New York, and Miss Minnie K. Bronson. Increased enthusiasm for the extension of the work followed this meeting and the organization was admitted to the National Association. A notable accession of membership, especially from the Twin Cities, followed.

In addition to local organizations in St. Paul and Minneapolis branches are being organized in various localities of the State, each under the direction of district vice-presidents of the State Association. The object is the circulation of literature and a general campaign of education throughout the State; this is given impetus by the fact that a legislative election comes on in November, 1914.

At the July meeting a memorial was presented to the National Educational Association, then in session in this city, protesting against the endorsement of woman suffrage by that body.

THE following is a report addressed to Mrs. Straight, President of the Minnesota Association, by Mrs. Pennington, President of the Minneapolis Association:

The Minneapolis Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women was organized about three months ago by eight women, but no earnest work was begun until June 16th, since which date we have been holding weekly meetings of the Executive Committee, which consists of the President, eight Vice-Presidents, Corresponding and Recording Secretaries, Treasurer and chairmen of the following committees: Publicity, Circulation, Legislative, Educational and Membership.

Our membership, without especial canvass, numbers about one hundred. Dues are twenty-five cents a year. Our Educational Committee is now getting out leaflets containing reasons why women are opposed to the vote. Some of these reasons are taken from the leaflets published by the National Association as well as from other sources. These leaflets will be very generally distributed.

On August 1st we expect to open headquarters on one of our principal retail streets, the lease having been signed yesterday. There will be a paid secretary in charge to give information, sell buttons and distribute literature. We have arranged for adequate representation at the State Fair and St. Paul has requested to co-operate with us.

On the 28th of this month I am giving an anti-suffrage tea, at which there will be addresses by one of our honorary presidents, Mrs. Walker, wife of Mr. T. B. Walker, who, of course you know, is one of our most distinguished and philanthropic citizens; by Mrs. Gilfillan, wife of Judge J. B. Gilfillan, and by Mrs. Stembel, wife of Mr. C. P. Stembel, superintendent of the Minneapolis and St. Louis Railroad. Invitations will be extended not only to the members of the Association, but to their friends who have not yet joined, and to those who are as yet undecided as to the side with which they will affiliate, and to any of the suffrage association who signify a desire to attend.

The Minneapolis Association's officers are: President, Mrs. Edmund Pennington; Honorary Presidents, Mrs. Harlow Gale, Mrs. T. B. Walker; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. E. L. Carpenter, Mrs. Geo. H. Christian, Mrs. H. A. Hanson, Mrs. Oscar Owre, Mrs. Alfred Pillsbury; Treasurer, Mrs. V. H. Van Slyke; Secretary, Miss Tessie Jones; Committee Chairmen—Educational, Mrs. C. A. Miliard; Extension, Mrs. Jno. J. Flather; Circulation, Mrs. Wm. H. Lee; Legislative, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan; Membership, Mrs. W. W. Sykes; Publicity, Mrs. W. D. Washburn.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

THE New Hampshire Association held an all-day meeting in Concord June 4th at which members were present from different sections of the State. The morning session was an informal conference. In the afternoon Mrs. William Lowell Putnam gave an address which made a very deep impression upon every one of her audience.

A branch has been formally organized in Exeter with Miss Sarah U. Clarke chairman and Miss Mabel Dana secretary. A branch is also being formed in Atkinson.

The press committee, which regularly contributes to four of our State papers, has recently been enlarged and plans are being made to extend this work.

An informal meeting was held in Manchester recently. Newport expects soon to have a meeting at which Miss Minnie Bronson will speak upon anti-suffrage.

NEW JERSEY

THE regular monthly meeting of the association was held at the home of Mrs. Alexander F. Jamison, at Spring Lake, on July 13th. Members from eleven State branches were present and during the morning session interesting reports were given by the chairman. The membership and enthusiasm are constantly increasing. New branches have been formed at Salem and Haddonfield. The following resolution was unanimously adopted:

That, In consideration of the resolution recently adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs at its convention held in Chicago in June, We, as members of the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, protest that many women belonging to the Federated Clubs of the State of New Jersey are not in favor of Woman Suffrage.

And we urge that the past absolutely neutral attitude of the clubs on the subjects of politics and religion be maintained.

A very interesting letter and article on Anti-Suffrage written to the headquarters of the New Jersey Association by the Rev. Mr. Oakes, of Davis, Okla., a Presbyterian clergyman, was read during the afternoon session.

An auction bridge party was given at the home of Mrs. Edward Murray, of Spring Lake, which was largely attended and was declared one of the must successful entertainments of the season. The women in charge of the tables were: Mrs. A. F. Jamison, Mrs. R. W. Smith, Mrs. Herman Getsinger, Mrs. Allan McDermott, Mrs. Eugene E. Hinkle, Miss Laura Plume, Mrs. Edw. Cross, Mrs. Jos. H. Oglesby, Mrs. Karl G. Roebling, Mrs. Helen Kelsey and Mrs. A. C. Clark.

NORTH DAKOTA

Many temperance workers in North Dakota who believe in the non-partisanship of the W. C. T. U. expressed surprise and regret that W. C. T. U. workers had abandoned the work of the Union in the wet State of Colorado, where women vote, to work for woman suffrage in the dry State of North Dakota, where men alone vote,

PENNSYLVANIA

SINCE June 1st the Association has added 1,000 new members to its lists. Numerous lot of packages of literature have been given out for debates and sent to people at the different summer resorts.

Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, who is speaking on our side in the Chautauqua Circuit, which covers most of the principal towns in Central and Eastern Pennsylvania, reports that the sentiment is strongly anti.

Miss M. Emmeline Pitt, of Pittsburgh, Field Secretary of the Legislative Committee, who has just returned from an extensive campaign in the central and western parts of the State, reported that various clubs, churches, civic and labor organizations had asked for literature and speakers to address anti-suffrage meetings and study classes they are planning.

Miss Eliza D. Armstrong, Chairman of the Western Division of the Legislative Committee in company with Miss Pitt, have attended annual conventions in central and western parts of the State.

While the legislative work in this section of the State is yet in its incipiency, we feel much encouraged by the manner in which many representative people have received our efforts in behalf of the anti-suffrage cause and against the passage of the constitutional amendment.

A large meeting was held on June 24th at the home of Mrs. Austin M. Purves at which Mrs. Frank J. Goodwin spoke. The meeting was held for the purpose of forming a study class in the fall.

Arrangements have been made for booths at the different county fairs throughout the State during August, September and October. The press work is increasing.

VIRGINIA

OUR literature committee is sending quantities of literature called for from all over the State, and the Secretary is mailing membership cards to various summer resorts upon request and will report many new members when we meet in October.

On July 3d at the University of Virginia Miss Bissell addressed an audience of 300, including many students of the University Summer School, as well as residents of the community, and presented her arguments in a way at once so logical and so lively as to interest all and convince not a few. There was general regret that her stay was so short and it is hoped that she will return in the winter and speak to town residents and students. The interest aroused by her speech has resulted in an active campaign for anti-suffrage enrollment in a community strongly anti, but, so far, not realizing the necessity of organizing in order to express its views. Much literature was distributed on this occasion.

Denial and Abuse are Not Argument

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SPRINGFIELD UNION:

It is to be regretted that the writer of the letter in your issue of May 16th filled with vituperation of the Anti-Suffragists should have felt obliged to assume this tone. Such letters hurt the cause of woman more than the writer realizes.

The best Suffragists and Anti-Suffragists alike want to help to make the world a better place to live in. Let us assume virtue in our opponents even if they have it not. Irritated denial is not argument and personal abuse of one's opponents is apt to recoil most annoyingly upon one's self. Let us discuss each the other's attitude with good humor and tolerance; else it will be inferred that we have no reason for our views. There is much that partakes of true humor in the suffrage attitude, which can be stated with no personality and over which both sides may laugh together. For instance, was there not something very funny in seeing Miss Foley travel in her car in the suffrage parade of May 2d bearing a red rose in her left hand labeled "Chivalry" and in her right a yellow banner inscribed "Justice," while at the back of her car was broadly displayed the legend "We do not want chivalry but justice"? (I quote perhaps incorrectly, as it is from memory.) Was this not intentionally funny, for the Suffragists had so recently killed the bill of the Anti-Suffragists asking that women of voting age might help to decide whether or not they want the vote? Surely to allow women themselves to decide their future career is not only in keeping with all civilized views regarding women, but it is a matter of common justice, and to deny it while leaving the matter for men alone to decide is a pure appeal to the very chivalry so vigorously denounced. Oh! well, psychologists know that we always denounce most ardently those things for which we most eagerly long in the hidden depths of our souls. Let us laugh good humoredly together over Miss Foley and her car.

MRS. WILLIAM LOWELL PUTNAM.

May 20, 1914.

The militants say that Mr. Balfour advised them "to make a fuss" in order to get the vote. Evidently, however, Mr. Balfour had no adequate conception of their capacity in that respect for he declined to vote in favor of the Suffrage Bill later on the ground that while he believed in the principle, he could not approve the method. He therefore abstained from voting altogether.

Woman's Protection Surer Without Ballot

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your issue of July 11th it is of interest to note the relative nature of Justice Ingraham's opinion in regard to the section of the labor law of 1913 which prohibits the employment of women in factories between the hours of 10 P. M. and 6 A. M. and the organized efforts to oppose woman suffrage. Justice Ingraham says:

"Upon the health of women as the child-bearing sex necessarily depends the future health of the succeeding generations. Any occupation that tends to lower the vitality of woman and interferes with her bearing healthy children directly impairs the health and capacity of future generations, and is a subject of the utmost public concern."

In this opinion of Justice Ingraham's is imbedded the basic principle for the opposition of woman suffrage. Women who are fighting for the ballot seem to forget that in establishing equal political rights they will necessarily sooner or later force equal industrial rights (or, better put, wrongs) from which woman must be protected.

Her physical status demands this protection.

T. H. L.

NEW YORK, July 12, 1914.

Suffrage in Australia a Menace

To the Editor of *The Sun*—Sir: Apropos of woman suffrage, it was my great privilege a few months ago to meet in Italy two highly cultivated ladies from Australia, and at once the conversation turned on this, to many women, burning topic. I asked: "What do the women of Australia think now of suffrage for women?"

The reply was significant and expressed with great earnestness:

"We do not stop to think about it at all, for we have had it twenty-five years and take it as a matter of course. But every thoughtful person knows it is an evil, a great menace for us, owing to the labor vote, which heavily outbalances the vote of the educated class and often to the detriment of the wisest efforts for our national development."

Let our men consider this statement made by women experienced in equal suffrage conditions, and let them not yield too readily and chivalrously to the evil of an added ignorant vote which is menacing our own development.

ANNE D. MURDOCK.

Danbury, N. H., July 27.

NOTES AND COMMENT

It Is Almost Time for Some Great Woman to Appear in Suffrage States

---

"On the other hand, a group of species that has appeared late may be a group of degenerates; but for that some special cause of retrogression must have intervened."—HENRI BERGSON.

Clara Bewick Colby says the Suffragists were told to "make a fuss" and so, of course, they did it. This unique instance of implicit obedience to the tyrant man is interesting. But why don't they obey him again—and stop?

That parade of delegates going to the President was to have been a mile long. Perhaps it was spread out to that extent, but there were actually 365 persons in it, including one baby and eight older children. There were seven States represented by banners—New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, Maryland, Louisiana, California and Illinois.

Those who are opposed to suffrage and feminism look with regret upon the influences exerted upon college girls by their women teachers. In England certain schools and colleges are known as "Suffragette factories" and are said to be constant feeders of the militant movement. According to the *Woman's Journal* several of the colleges for girls in this country are also becoming Suffragist factories.

A Suffragette, being tried for disorderly conduct unbecoming a lady, shouted as she was bundled out: "There is something rotten in the State of Denmark!" Of course there is, but apparently she did not know what it was. The question before the English government at present is how to get rid of the rottenness in question and to give new life to the constitution of the "State of Denmark."

"The new constitution gives the women the right of suffrage with restrictions. The restrictions are that the women shall be able to read and shall own property. As less than one woman out of ten thousand can read and own property as yet, there is no chance for the women to vote."—From an address on "China" by Miss Ethel Wheeler, missionary, delivered at the Franklindale Baptist Church, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., July 13, 1914.

More than a million petitions for the Parliamentary franchise have been presented to the English Government, according to Mrs. Colby—and probably all emanating from the same minority. No one questions the activity of Suffragists—it is the wisdom of their demands that we doubt.

"In 1882 the word 'male' was inserted before the word 'person' in the (British) Reform Bill, which gave the first extension of the franchise in England. While women may not have made any great effort to vote before, as soon as it was prohibited they very naturally desired to remove that prohibition, and spasmodic efforts were made to have the rights of women recognized," says Clara Bewick Colby (Suffragist).

In the opinion of Miss Marjorie Dorman, secretary of the Wage-Earners' Anti-Suffrage League of New York, "the Suffragists are the greatest enemies of the working women in this country to-day. They are menacing the protective legislation which discriminates in favor of the working woman. Legal equality for men and women is the last thing in the world which women desire. We want the shorter day, the abolition of night work, the prohibition of all dangerous occupations and those which require constant standing. When I was proofreader in a printing shop I learned the need of women for privileges and protections from the law, which men do not ask nor need."

"Miss Suffragette of other days has now become the woman of the terror. Those who were formerly content to dream of limited suffrage now demand universal suffrage with all its drawbacks. Once Jenny cultivated the flowers in her window, now she goes to war. They imagine they will gain by the change. They deceive themselves. Nearly all the conquests of feminism are victories like that of Phyrrhus. Feminists think they are working for the happiness of women. They are only, on the contrary, working to free the conscience of men from all sorts of scruples. They are not doing our work, but they are encouraging our selfishness. Their propaganda is spread in the interest of our vices. An example of this is their stupid campaign in favor of divorce."

—THEODORE JORAN.

(The book from which this is selected has just been crowned by the Academie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, 1913.

Lady Lillian Glandworth in a French review makes a plea for gaining the vote *"par douceur."* We had been anticipating this. The same old "indirect influence"—"Sweetness."—Shades of Miss Anthony.

SUFFRAGE for women failed of a favorable report in two committees of the Georgia Legislature July 7th by one vote. The House Committee on Constitutional Amendments decided, 5 to 4, to report adversely a bill giving women the right to the ballot in State and county elections. The Senate Committee voted 5 to 1 against reporting the bill to the Senate.

DESPITE a decision of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives to hold no meetings during July, a large number of Suffragists marched to the Capitol on July 13th and demanded a hearing, following their unsatisfactory call upon the President ten days earlier.

The three Democratic members who chanced to be in Washington refused flatly to sign a petition urging that the Bristow-Mondell amendment be reported out of committee. Following this refusal Mrs. W. F. Hancock, president of the district section of the National Women's Democratic League, said: "I personally feel that it is unlikely that the Democratic party will continue to receive the support previously accorded to it by countless women if it persists in its present most unsatisfactory attitude toward suffrage." And Miss Alice Paul, speaking more militantly, said: "The Democratic party will inevitably feel the result in the November elections."

ONE of our prominent weekly publications has a very bright suffrage writer on the staff, and her arguments are apt to be logically presented and enlivened by wit. But recently I was a bit puzzled by her comment on a proposed long "hike." "What have men ever done to earn the vote?" she asks. Are these long hikes, then, undertaken to earn the ballot? Then the lady with the largest and strongest feet most truly earns it, evidently.

Said the Suffragist, "All of this hiking
Is not very much to my liking,
  But the world will take note
  That I thus earn my vote;
Now isn't my argument striking?"

Said the hobo, "De hike I invented,
An' me claim fur de vote I presented
  On de grounds dat youse state,
  But dey showed me the gate,
Sure, dem guys at de polls is demented!"

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set 50 cts. Single copies 5 cts.

Selected packages 25c.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Noted Neurologist Pours Hot Shot, etc. *Dr. Wm. Hirsch*
Should We Ask for the Suffrage? *Mrs. Schulyer Van Rensselaer*
Woman's Relation to Government *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
New Zealand and Australia, etc.
How Women Can Best Serve the State *Mrs. Barclay Hazard*
The Blank Cartridge Ballot *Rossiter Johnson*
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage *Hon. Harold J. Hinman*
Address (Made before Constitutional Convention, 1894) *Hon. Elihu Root*
Taxation and Suffrage *Frederick Dwight*
Woman's Progress *vs.* Woman Suffrage *Helen Kendrick Johnson*
Woman and the Law *Francis M. Scott*
First Legislative Address *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
Woman Suffrage *Carl Schurz*
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy, etc.
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

The Militant and the Child *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Woman's Rights *vs.* Woman Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State *Minnie Bronson*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government *Prof. Edward Cope*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question *Miss Emily P. Bissell*
Should Women Vote? *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
An Open Letter to Clergymen
Arguments in Verse *Florence Goff Schwarz*
Dodgers—Statistics
Silk Pins.....10c. each Ribbon....10c. and 15c. a yard
Celluloid Buttons.....5c. Pennants.....15c. and 25c.

NEW YORK STATE MEN'S ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO POLITICAL SUFFRAGE FOR WOMEN

27 William Street Room 1823 New York City
Brief before Rules Committee, Washington, D. C., Dec. 4, 1913 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Questionaire
Women and The Vote *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Principle Biologically Unsound *Prof. William I. Sedgwick*

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

On Suffrage (0.5) *C. K. Chesterton*
Votes for Women (10c.) *Frederic Harrison*
Woman Adrift ($1.50) *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) *J. Lionel Tayler*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) *Ida Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00) *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
The Response of Woman (40c.) *Arthur W. Robinson, D. D.*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

Anti-Suffrage Calendar for 1911, with many interesting quotations. These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

We recommend to our readers THE LIVE ISSUE, published weekly. Subscription 50c. Office, 345 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. Also, THE REMONSTRANCE; subscription, 25c.; 687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women:
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? *Frank Foxcraft*
Taxpaying Suffrage *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Opinions of Eminent Persons Against Woman Suffrage
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practise—An Answer to George Creel
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage *Mrs. George A. Caswell*

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.
Selected Packages, 25 Cents.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

..... 1914

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....year's subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Subscription Rate $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....